



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

advanced portions of his book, and they are certain to demand at once, and quite rightly, where his information comes from. There are a number of statements scattered through his pages which will make his readers "sit up"; some on account of their naïveté, others because of their wide departures from hitherto accepted views. We cannot think, for instance, that Elizabeth's indifference to purely religious questions, and zeal for the maintenance of her prerogative have "been largely overlooked" (p. 242) in explaining her ecclesiastical policy. On the other hand our author's assertions that "it has been too frequently stated that fines for non-attendance at the new worship were not actively enforced", and that "such a position is unhistorical" (p. 188), will at once be challenged by anyone who has studied the documents at the Record Office. We look eagerly for the authority on which Mr. Kennedy rests his case; but none appears. The text indeed continues: "Evidence exists from 1561 to 1570 (and indeed we may say to the end of the reign) of a character which cannot be disputed, proving that fines for non-conformity were levied with unfailing consistency"; but if so why not tell us where to find it? Far more substantial proof than this is needed to support such sweeping statements as the above.

The book, in fact, was worth doing much better if it was worth doing at all. The author evidently has a wide acquaintance with Tudor tracts and ecclesiastical writings, and some of his ideas are distinctly interesting: more's the pity he has not taken enough pains in developing them. The whole work plainly shows the influence of Professor Pollard, to whom it is dedicated—but of Professor Pollard in his more cock-sure and over-confident mood. Certainly no one but a Maitland can afford to proclaim so much, without putting in all the evidence. Mr. Kennedy's book may profitably be utilized as an object-lesson by those who teach that it is the first duty of the student of history to learn to doubt.

ROGER B. MERRIMAN.

*A Critical Study of the Historical Method of Samuel Rawson Gardiner, with an Excursus on the Historical Conception of the Puritan Revolution from Clarendon to Gardiner.* By ROLAND G. USHER, Professor of History, Washington University. [Washington University Studies, vol. III., pt. II., no. 1.] (St. Louis: Washington University. 1915. Pp. 159.)

THIS is an interesting as well as a learned essay. Professor Usher traces the literary and historical criticism of Gardiner's work from the faultfinding with his early productions to the unquestioning acceptance and almost fulsome praise of his later volumes; he draws for us a picture, unique in its detail, of the methods of work of a typical historian; he gives us much incisive discussion of English history during the early Stuart period and much information on the views expressed by its various historians. Yet on the whole we are inclined to think his work

a monument of misdirected scholarship. Mr. Usher's real thesis is Gardiner's inconsistencies. He is able to quote from Mr. Gardiner's various works certain apparently irreconcilable estimates of the characters of James and Charles, Laud and Strafford, Cromwell and Pym. He is able to point out many instances in which a general statement does not seem to be consistent with individual statements made elsewhere. He can find numerous apparently incompatible judgments on many large questions.

Some of these contradictions seem to us to lie rather in Mr. Usher's over-refined analysis than in Mr. Gardiner's essential meaning. But our principal criticism is more fundamental. Consistency in estimating an historical character, in our opinion, should be avoided by the historian, rather than sought for. A man is not a constant but a variable factor, reacting differently to different influences and at different times, and exhibiting varied powers and inclinations under different kinds of stimulus. Paul found within him two men; Oliver Wendell Holmes expatiates on the threefold "young man named John"; and most of us are inwardly aware of quite inconsistent characteristics. King Charles or Cromwell is not a simple personality, to be classified, labelled, and characterized once for all, and Mr. Gardiner does well not to trouble himself to conform to such an improper requirement. A definite, clear-cut characterization of an historical personage should be looked upon by the reader with much suspicion. A figure so characterized belongs in the realm of fiction—and not the highest fiction—not in that of history or genuine psychology. Such a person does not exist now, and it is not likely he existed in the past. Again, Mr. Usher treats such expressions as "the medieval constitution", "the Elizabethan constitution", "the policy of James", "Puritanism", "the discretionary power of the crown", "the English nation", and other familiar forms of historical speech as indivisible entities, concerning which two divergent statements cannot be made without inconsistency. But these conceptions are exceedingly complex. Mr. Gardiner more properly speaks of "that mass of custom and opinion . . . called the English constitution". Two seventeenth-century statesmen of quite opposite policies can both be truly described as striving to "bring back the Elizabethan constitution". That expression includes some elements that appealed to a Strafford, others to an Eliot. Much of the adverse criticism in the chapter called the Problem of Consistency, we cannot help considering perverted ingenuity. We prefer the "inconsistencies" of Mr. Gardiner to the unrealities of Mr. Usher.

Further, we do not agree with the author that it is the duty of the historian to provide the reader with political and ethical judgments, or, as he says, to decide "where lay the blame for the Civil War". We object to his dicta, "The reader should be interested in the narrative less for itself than for the generalizations which he expects it to establish. The historian who has not left his reader a clear, consistent,

unified idea of what the period means cannot be held to have discharged his trust." This is the same view as that of a critic in one of the literary journals Mr. Usher quotes so frequently, who complains that in Mr. Gardiner's writing "the reader is made to be a judge as well as a learner". But should he be blamed for this? Is it the function of the historian not only to give final judgments on the characters and careers of men but to justify or condemn great human movements? After the historian has told his story such philosophic reflections may well be left as a privilege to the reader.

It is obvious that Mr. Usher does not like Mr. Gardiner's attitude of extreme liberalism, and disapproves as heartily of many of his general results as he does of the processes which he considers do not lead to them. But it is not these differences of opinion that we condemn; nor is it the slight but annoying tone of superiority that runs through the whole work; nor is it even what we consider Mr. Usher's exaggerated view of the functions of history. It is rather the application of so much knowledge, ingenuity, and labor on the part of an excellent scholar not to some constructive and positive historical work but to the search for petty flaws in the work of a great historian. It is true that in the last two chapters of Mr. Usher's work a broader treatment is introduced and there is much bright and suggestive discussion of the influence of general ideas upon historical writers; but so far as Mr. Gardiner is concerned this amounts to little more than his depreciation in general instead of piecemeal.

*Of Reformation touching Church-Discipline in England.* By JOHN MILTON. Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Glossary by WILL TALIAFERRO HALE, Ph.D. [Yale Studies in English, vol. LIV.] (New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Oxford University Press. 1916. Pp. lxxxix, 224.)

THE volume before us is a very elaborate edition of a rather uninteresting prose work by a great poet. The editor divides his thesis into five main sections: (1) Introduction, (2) Text, (3) Notes, (4) Glossary, (5) Bibliography. The Introduction alone covers eighty-one pages and is subdivided into eight carefully elaborated sections entitled: (A) Authorship and Date, (B) Biographical Settings, (C) Historical Occasion, (D) Point of View, (E) Sources and Allusions, (F) Style, (G) Summary of the Argument, and (H) Text. The editor in his preface (p. iv) states his belief that the "most valuable part of this edition is . . . the notes"—a very reasonable view. Dr. Hale seems to have done his work with thoroughness and care, but we have noted a few minor inaccuracies in the type-setting. In general, too, the editor appears to have been very fair in his estimates, but when on page xviii he speaks of "Whitgift's wise . . . management", we are obliged to disagree. Few historians of any prominence to-day, we believe, would support